| 1  | ELN   | 1 STRI  | EET         |           |            |                     |            | *         | BEF                     | FORE T    | THE        |           |            |         |  |
|----|---|---|-------------|-----------|------------|---------------------|------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|---------|--|
| 2  | DEVELOPMENT, INC.   |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           | PLANNING BOARD OF       |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 3  | ZON   | NING E  | BOARD       | CASE      | NO.: 2     | ZB 110              | *          | НО        | HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 4  | *   | *   | *           | *         | *          | *                   | *          | *         | *                       | *         | *          | *         | *          | *       |  |
| 5  |   | МО  | TION:       | To r      | есотт      | end ap <sub>j</sub> | proval d   | of the pe | etition re              | equestii  | ng an a    | mended    | l Prelim   | inary   |  |
| 6  | Development Plan for an Age-restricted Adult Housing Development  |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 7  |   | AC'   | ΓΙΟΝ:       | Reco      | ommeno     | ded Ap              | proval;    | Vote 4 i  | to 0                    |           | J          |           | -          |         |  |
| 8  | *   | *   | *           | *         | *          | *                   | *          | *         | *                       | *         | *          | *         | *          | *       |  |
| 9  |   | On N  | May 24, 2   | 012, th   | e Planniı  | ıg Boar             | d of Hov   | ward Cou  | ınty, Ma                | ryland, o | consider   | ed the p  | etition of | Elm     |  |
| 10 | On May 24, 2012, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, considered the petition of Elm Street Development, Inc. for an amended Preliminary Development Plan for an Age-restricted Adult Housing |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 11 | Development with 10 single-family detached dwellings and 87 single-family attached dwellings. The   |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 12 | Petiti  | oner wa   | is represe  | nted by   | Jason V    | 'an Kirk            | c. There   | was no te | estimony                | in oppo   | osition to | o the pet | ition.     |         |  |
| 13 |   | The   | petition, t | he Dep    | artment    | of Plan             | ning and   | Zoning    | Technic                 | al Staff] | Report a   | nd Reco   | mmenda     | tion,   |  |
| 14 | and the comments of reviewing agencies, were presented to the Board for its consideration. The Department   |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 15 | of Planning and Zoning recommended approval of the petition based on findings that the proposed amended   |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 16 | Preliminary Development Plan will still comply with the criteria for the PSC (Planned Senior Community)   |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           | ity)       |           |            |         |  |
| 17 | District zoning originally approved on the subject property in Zoning Board Case No. ZB 1041M in 2005.  |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            | 05.       |            |         |  |
| 18 | Mr. Van Kirk explained how the project will comply with the universal design guidelines. He noted   |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           | oted       |           |            |         |  |
| 19 | that the subject property has been through several Zoning Board cases related to its PSC zoning, and that the   |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           | at the     |           |            |         |  |
| 20 | intent  | t of this   | project h   | as alwa   | ys been    | for age-            | -restricte | d adult h | ousing.                 | Mr. Van   | Kirk st    | ated that | while th   | ere is  |  |
| 21 | a mai   | ket for   | age-restri  | cted ad   | ult hous   | ing apaı            | rtments,   | such a de | esign ne                | cessitate | s expens   | sive und  | erground   |         |  |
| 22 | stormwater management, and there is a very good market for the villas and the single-family detached  |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 23 | dwellings that are proposed. He pointed out that the community likes the new plan because the building  |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 24 | heigh   | ts are lo   | ower than   | the pre   | vious pl   | an with             | the apar   | tment bu  | ildings.                | In respo  | nse to a   | question  | n about w  | vhether |  |
| 25 | there is a need for all the parking spaces that are proposed, he stated that having the extra parking provided on   |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 26 | the pa  | arking p  | ads in fro  | ont of th | ne units i | s desira            | ble from   | ı a marke | eting star              | ndpoint.  |            |           |            |         |  |
| 27 | In its deliberation on the case, Board members expressed that the proposed amended plan is an overal  |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 28 | better project, that it complies with all the PSC District criteria, that the proposed amended plan is not a  |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 29 | significant change, and that the proposed amended plan has less density. The need for the large amount of   |   |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            |           |            |         |  |
| 30 | parki   | parking was questioned, and it was expressed that future projects should explore moving away from the |             |           |            |                     |            |           |                         |           |            | ;         |            |         |  |
| 31 | conce   | ept of pr   | oviding a   | lot of    | addition   | al parki            | ng space   | s.        |                         |           |            |           |            |         |  |

Paul Yelder made the motion to recommend approval of the amended Preliminary Development Plan.

Bill Santos seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 4 to 0.

32

33

| 1  | For the foregoing reasons, the Planning Board of Howard County, Maryland, on this 21st day of June | e, |
|----|--|----|
| 2  | 2012, recommends that Zoning Board Case No. ZB 1011M, as described above, be APPROVED.             |    |
| 3  |  |    |
| 4  | HOWARD COUNTY, PLANNING BOARD  |    |
| 5  |  |    |
| 6  | David Grabowski, Chairman  |    |
| 7  | Haml Cult  |    |
| 8  | Paul Yelder  |    |
| 9  |  |    |
| 10 | Joshua Tzuker  |    |
| 11 | aloll I. A   |    |
| 12 | Bill Santos  |    |
| 13 | ABSENT   |    |
| 14 | Jacqueline Easley  |    |
| 15 |  |    |
| 16 |  |    |
| 17 |  |    |
| 18 | ATTEST:  |    |
| 19 | march V. Ja. well  |    |
| 20 | Marsha S. McLaughlin, Executive Secretary  |    |
| 21 |  |    |
| 22 |  |    |
| 23 |  |    |
|    |  |    |